



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-9-19-4

Date of VPC Meeting	May 6, 2019
Request From	R-5 TOD-1 PISSP (Approved C-2 TOD-1 PISSP) (0.58 acres) and R-5 TOD-1 PISSP (Approved C-2 H-R TOD-1PISSP) (17.24 acres)
Request To	WU Code T6:HWR UT
Proposed Use	Mixed-use
Location	Northeast corner of Central Avenue and Indian School Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per staff stipulations.
VPC Vote	14-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

2 cards were submitted in support, wishing to speak.

3 cards were submitted wishing to speak but did not indicate support or opposition.

Ms. Maja Brkovic noted that that item nos. 3 and 4 would be heard at the same time but that two separate motions would need to be made.

Ms. Joshua Bednarek, Deputy Director with Planning and Development provided an overview of the request noting the parameters and history for the Specific Plan, why there was a need to have it removed as it related to the Walkable Urban Code and the schedule for future meetings.

Ms. Brkovic provided an overview of the rezoning request noting the surrounding uses, surrounding zoning, general plan land use designation, description of the proposed site plan and elevations, staff's findings, stipulations and recommendation.

Mr. Ben Tate, Withey Morris PLC, representing the applicant, provided an overview of the request noting the project designers for the site, site history and an in-depth explanation of the elevations and planned pedestrian experience. He expressed that the project would provide a public accessible gateway into the park, he noted that the gateway was identified as the "canyon" on the site plan. He stated that a major part of the project included ground floor retail or other amenities such as a grocery store and a movie theater. He noted that the podium parking levels would be design in such a way that the space had the potential of turning into other uses. He provided an overview of the sustainability features which included rain water

collection, possibility of solar and expressed that the orientation of the buildings provided maximum shade on pedestrian pathways.

Mr. Drew Bryck asked if the applicant was working with staff to modify the stipulation related to the 30-foot landscape buffer along Indian School Road. **Mr. Tate** noted that the applicant will be proposing new language to staff prior to Planning Commission. He indicated that the design intent along Indian School Road was to provide a pedestrian friendly environment with passive amenities and landscaping.

Mr. Paul Benjamin asked that Mr. Tate convince him that the project would break ground. **Mr. Tate** noted that the applicant was a local resident and very involved throughout the planning process. He indicated that the client had greatly invested into the project and would be looking ahead to site development after City Council.

Ms. Layla Ressler asked if the repeal of the Specific Plan was a repeal to the Federal Government. **Mr. Bednarek** noted that the Federal Government asked that the City develop the plan in exchange to receiving the land. He noted that the plan as written, and most of the area developed as envisioned by the plan except for the subject site. He indicated that the city governed the plan and therefore did not necessitate further input or discussion at the Federal level.

Mr. Abraham James asked if there would be an affordable housing component as part of the project. **Mr. Tate** noted that there would not be an affordable housing component. He indicated that it was hard for developers to provide affordable housing after spending a year of money on design and planning. He indicated that the city needed to complete an affordable housing plan which indicates how much affordable housing is needed. He explained that the plan would provide certainty to developers to understand how much affordable housing would be needed up front so that they can plan for it as they move forward with their projects. He noted that developer needed certainty up front regarding affordable housing to properly plan for their development.

Mr. Brent Kleinman expressed that he liked the project and expressed that he would not like to see chain restaurants included as part of the project. **Mr. Tate** noted that it was not in their interest to have chain restaurants.

Ms. Ann Cothron noted that the original proposal indicated that the development would include Native American motifs and asked if the developer would be following suit. **Mr. Tate** noted that those conversations have taken place and the developer was working with Native American connections.

Ms. Nicole Rodriguez expressed the importance of lighting and keeping lights out of the eyes of residents or pedestrians that would walk the site in the future.

Mr. Steve Procaccini expressed that the renderings did not illustrate that the “canyon” was oriented toward the peak but rather the foothills. **Mr. Tate** noted that the canyon would be oriented toward the peak but that the view of the mountain would vary depending on where a pedestrian is standing within the gateway.

Ms. G.G. George suggested that the developer consider changing the name of the project. She indicated that during her research, as part of writing the Encanto Palmcroft book, she found that there was a Central Park already in the City of Phoenix.

Mr. Aaron Searles expressed that he liked the project and thought that it would open the park to more visitors. He expressed that the applicant works further to ensure that the view from the gateway was to the peak of the mountain and asked what the expected time of construction would be. **Mr. Tate** noted that the project was large and would be done in phases. He noted that construction would take 10-20 years for full completion.

Mr. Drew Bryck expressed that the pedestrian experience along Central Avenue heading north should be active. He noted that he would not like to see exercise room lining Central Avenue. **Mr. Tate** noted that the plan was to have active uses with a mix of food and beverage. **Mr. Bryck** suggested that a stipulation be added to require a monument sign for the park along Glenrosa Avenue. **Ms. Brkovic** noted that the northern portion of the right-of-way was not part of the project and that it was owned by the Parks Department.

Mr. Procaccini asked if an enhanced bus stop could be provided on the site along Indian School Road. **Ms. Brkovic** noted that an enhanced bus stop could only be approved by The Public Transit Department and that any deviation from the standard detail would require that the bus pad be on private property and maintained by the property owner. **Mr. Tate** noted that the only bus stop adjacent to their site was located along Central Avenue.

Mr. Kleinman asked for clarification regarding the signage along Central Avenue. **Mr. Tate** noted that the plan was to provide a main entrance sign between the two buildings at the corner. **Mr. Kleinman** asked how the project planned on preventing vehicles driving through the site regarding pedestrian safety. **Mr. Tate** noted that they realized that cut through traffic would be a problem and that they are taking steps to look at possible solutions to discourage such behavior. He noted that moving forward they would be working with the Street Transportation Department to finalize a circulation plan.

Mr. Procaccini asked if subterranean parking was considered for the project. **Mr. Tate** noted that two subterranean parking garages were planned for the site.

Mr. Matthew Jewett asked if recycling would be part of the project, who would pay for water and sewer upgrades if needed and who would review and approve the traffic impact study. **Mr. Tate** noted that they would like to provide recycling for the project. **Ms. Brkovic** noted that the developer would be required to pay for the water and sewer upgrades and that a traffic engineer in the Street Transportation Department would be reviewing and approving the traffic study.

Ms. Margaret Dietrich, resident in the area and in support of the project made the following statements:

- Noted that the project included a world class design and would be an enhancement for the intersection.

- Noted that she likes that the development was open and did not include walls or fences on the perimeters.

Mr. Arthur Vigil, phoenix resident, made the following comments:

- Indicated that although he had no issues with the scale and intensity of the project, he had issues with the design noting that the design was hyper suburban.
- Noted that the design looked like other developments and that the site should have been designed to be unique to Phoenix.
- He noted that the design would attract chain restaurants and not mom and pop establishment.
- He stated that the design should focus on creating a vibrant street culture.

Ms. Susan Thompson, resident in the area and in support of the project, made the following comments:

- Noted that this was one of the few locations where a high-density project could develop that was not near the backwards of single-family homes.
- Stated that the development would create intersection and would entice nearby residents to spend more time outdoors.
- Noted that she liked the highline model as seen in New York for the canyon.
- Stated that she believed that the applicant and developer would endorse local shops and restaurants and believed that they were committed to the community.

Ms. Patty Talahongva, phoenix resident, made the following comments:

- Noted that she attended Phoenix Indian School High School.
- Concerned that the new buildings would place shadows on the historic buildings.
- Had concerns about how artifacts would be handled and noted that staff went through the archeology stipulations too quickly.

Ms. Lisa Fletcher, business owner in the area, made the following comments:

- Concerned about traffic in relation to construction.
- Noted that larger setbacks should be placed along Central Avenue.
- Concerned about effect on nearby businesses.

Mr. Tate noted that it would be 5 to 10 years before the development would be fully developed. He noted that the only effect on the roadway would be during the initial phase if the infrastructure needed to be updated. He noted that all other construction would occur on the site. Noted that the materials used would not provide a heat island effect. He indicated that Central Avenue and Indian School Road would be buffered and decorative to provide a pedestrian friendly experience.

Mr. Jay Silverberg, architect with Gensler, noted that there would be glazing on the windows and that sun shading devices would be placed on the east and west sides of the building.

Ms. Layla Ressler brought up concern regarding the archeology stipulation in relation to Ms. Talahongava's concerns. She specifically had concerns with using the term "if determined necessary" in the stipulation. **Ms. Brkovic** noted that the stipulations utilized standard language that is used on all properties throughout the City of Phoenix for archeologically sensitive sites. She noted that she will connect Ms. Talahongava with the archeology department to help answer any questions that she may have.

Motion:

Brent Kleinman made a motion to approve Z-9-19-4 per staff stipulations.

Nicole Rodriguez seconded the motion.

Vote:

The motion was approved, Vote: 14-0

Roll Call:

Yes - Jake Adams, Ann Cothron, Paul Benjamin, Drew Bryck, G.G. George, Matthew Jewett, Abraham James, Matthew Jewett, Brent Kleinman, Jayson Matthews, Steve Procaccini, Layal Ressler, Nicole Rodriguez, Aaron Searles and Rebecca Wininger.

No – None

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.